



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/392,468	09/09/1999	MARC A. SMITH	1026-019/MMM	1203

38991 7590 10/25/2004

CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC  
1420 FIFTH AVENUE  
SUITE 2800  
SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347

EXAMINER

YUAN, ALMARI ROMERO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

16817

DATE MAILED: 10/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/392,468

Applicant(s)

SMITH ET AL.

Examiner

Almari Yuan

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 July 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 43-55 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## Interview Summary

Application No.

09/392,468

Applicant(s)

SMITH ET AL.

Examiner

Almari Yuan

Art Unit

2176

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Almari Yuan, USPTO.

(3) Mr. John Campa, #49,014.

(2) William Bashore, USPTO.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 14 October 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 23, 43, and 50.

Identification of prior art discussed: Rao (USPN 6,085,202) and Lokuge (USPN 6,252,597).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative asserted the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art of record. Further consideration will be given in light of Applicant's arguments.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

## Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

### Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

### Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

#### Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

#### 37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,  
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

### Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: RCE and Preliminary Amendment filed 7/27/04.
2. Claims 43-55 are newly added. Claims 1-55 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 23, 43, and 50 are independent claims.

### ***Election/Restrictions***

3. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-42, drawn to visualization of threaded information entries, classified in class 715, subclass 526.
  - II. Claims 43-55, drawn to associating messages with identifiers, classified in class 345, subclasses 751 and 752.
4. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention II has separate utility such as associating messages with identifiers to create and provide a message representation to be displayed. See MPEP § 806.05(d).
5. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, and because the search

Art Unit: 2176

required for Groups I and II are separate, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

6. Newly submitted claims 43-55 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: Claims 43-55 are drawn to a method for creating and providing message representation by associating messages with identifiers to identify relationships between messages.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 43-55 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

7. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-22 set forth a functional descriptive material but fail to set forth an arrangement of data (information entries) embodied in a computer-readable media. The arrangement of data (information entries) that is not tangibly embodied in a computer-readable media is not capable of causing functional change in the computer. Such claimed “arrangement” do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the arrangement of data and other claimed aspects of the invention, which permit the data arrangement’s functionality to be realized.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. **Claims 1-3, 7-12, 14-26, 30-35, and 37-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lokuge (USPN 6,252,597 B1 - filed on 2/1997) in view of Rao et al. (USPN 6,085,202 - filed on 3/1998).**

**Regarding independent claim 1, Lokuge discloses:**

In an threaded information visualization system that provides a visualization of threaded information that includes plural threaded information entries, a graphical representation of the threaded information rendered on a display screen (on col. 2, line 6 – col. 3, line 14: teaches plurality of entries in a tree structure), comprising:

an indented threading arrangement of parallel (on col. 6, lines 8-15 and col. 11, lines 5-43: teaches indentation of categories (entries) in a hierarchical arrangement; categories can be arranged in parallel structure (see figures 15 and 16)).

However, Lokuge does not explicitly disclose, “generally one dimensional entry lines that each represent one of the threaded information entries”.

Rao et al. (Rao) on col. 16, lines 33-37 and col. 17, lines 46-54, see figures 14 and 15: teaches one-dimensional array or row (entry lines).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Rao into Lokuge to provide one-dimensional rows in a hierarchical

Art Unit: 2176

arrangement on a graphical display, as taught by Rao, incorporated into the hierarchical arrangement of indented categories (entries), as taught by Lokuge, in order to permit the user to quickly and efficiently specify and locate information of particular interest.

**Regarding dependent claims 2 and 25, Rao discloses:**

in which the threaded information entries include plural fields of entry information and in which the entry lines are rendered with variations corresponding to information in one or more of the predefined fields of entry information (on col. 12, line 50 – col. 13, line 5: teaches mapping entries with cell regions).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Rao into Lokuge to provide a way to map (associate) entries with a plurality of cell regions (fields), as taught by Rao, incorporated into the system of Lokuge, in order to enhance the display of images directly representing an item of data in the data structure.

**Regarding dependent claims 3 and 26, Lokuge discloses:**

in which individual entry lines are rendered with colors corresponding to information in one or more of the predefined fields of the entry information for the individual threaded information entries (Lokuge on col. 7, lines 35-48: teaches colors corresponding to categories).

**Regarding dependent claims 7, 9, 30, and 32, Lokuge discloses:**

in which the entry lines are rendered with lengths corresponding to information in one or more of the predefined fields of entry information (on col. 8, lines 26-34: teaches text or symbols showing in the expansive locations may be resized).

**Regarding dependent claims 8, 11, 12, 31, and 34, Lokuge discloses:**



Art Unit: 2176

in which the entry lines are rendered at positions corresponding to information in one or more of the predefined fields of entry information (on col. 11, lines 5-43: teaches providing a range of indentation to position displayed information objects).

**Regarding dependent claims 10 and 33, Lokuge discloses:**

in which each information entry includes an amount of information and in which the one or more predefined fields of entry information relates to the amount of information in the information entry (on col. 6, lines 33-52: teaches resizing defined region to permit user to view all the information in that region).

**Regarding dependent claims 14, 21, 39, and 41, Lokuge discloses:**

in which the threaded information includes threads that begin with top-level information entries, the graphical representation further comprising text information only about top-level information entries (Lokuge on col. 6, lines 8-15: teaches top tier categories (entries)).

**Regarding dependent claims 15 and 37, Lokuge discloses:**

in which the entry lines are horizontal (on col. 6, lines 8-15: teaches horizontal dimensions (entry lines)).

**Regarding dependent claims 16 and 38, Lokuge discloses:**

in which the entry lines are arranged vertically (on col. 6, lines 8-15: teaches vertical dimensions).

**Regarding dependent claim 17, Lokuge discloses:**

in which the threaded information includes threads that begin with top-level information entries and in which the entry indicators representing the top-level information entries include spacing between them (on col. 5, lines 53-57: teaches create space within a list of information).

Art Unit: 2176

**Regarding dependent claims 18 and 19, Rao discloses:**

in which plural ones of the entry indicators are positioned together to represent a thread of threaded information and in which the entry indicators representing the thread include no spacing between them transverse to their one dimension (on col. 21, lines 1-24 and col. 26, lines 8-36, see figures 14 and 15: teaches zero spacing (no spacing) for entries as the amount of space).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Rao into Lokuge to provide zero spacing of each entry for user to select a focal region of cells, as taught by Rao, incorporated into the system of Lokuge, to effectively view selected regions of interest.

**Regarding dependent claims 20 and 40, Rao discloses:**

in which the entry lines associated with the information entries of a user-selected thread are replaced with enlarged entry bars (on col. 14, lines 47-67: teaches replacing character information with graphical display object as different types of bars 30, 32, 36).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Rao into Lokuge to provide a way to replace character information (entries) with graphical display objects as different types of bars, as taught by Rao, incorporated into the system of Lokuge, in order to enhance the display of each character information within a cell.

**Regarding dependent claims 22 and 42, Rao discloses:**

in which user-selected enlarged entry bars are distinguished from other enlarged entry bars (on col. 14, lines 47-67: teaches different types of bars 30, 32, 36).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Rao into Lokuge to provide a way to replace character information (entries) with graphical display objects as different types of bars, as taught by Rao, incorporated into the system of Lokuge, in order to enhance the display of each character information within a cell.

**Regarding independent claim 23,** Lokuge discloses:

At least one computer readable medium having instructions stored thereon, which when executed by at least one processing system, cause the processing system to implement threaded information visualization software providing a visualization of threaded information that includes plural threaded information entries (on col. 2, line 6 – col. 3, line 14: teaches plurality of entries in a tree structure), the at least one medium comprising:

a rendering engine instructions for rendering a threaded information visualization as indented threading arrangement (on col. 6, lines 8-15 and col. 11, lines 5-43: teaches indentation of categories (entries) in a hierarchical arrangement).

However, Lokuge does not explicitly disclose, “generally one dimensional entry lines that each represent one of the threaded information entries”.

Rao on col. 16, lines 33-37 and col. 17, lines 46-54, see figures 14 and 15: teaches one-dimensional array or row (entry lines).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Rao into Lokuge to provide one-dimensional rows in a hierarchical arrangement on a graphical display, as taught by Rao, incorporated into the hierarchical

Art Unit: 2176

arrangement of indented categories (entries), as taught by Lokuge, in order to permit the user to quickly and efficiently specify and locate information of particular interest.

**Regarding dependent claim 24**, Lokuge discloses:

further comprising user interface controls for allowing user to select form among plural visualization formats (Lokuge on col. 3, lines 40-67: teaches formats) that each include an indented threading arrangement of parallel (Lokuge on col. 6, lines 8-15 and col. 11, lines 5-43: teaches indentation of categories (entries) in a hierarchical arrangement; categories can be arranged in parallel structure (see figures 15 and 16)), generally one-dimensional entry lines (Rao on col. 16, lines 33-37 and col. 17, lines 46-54, see figures 14 and 15: teaches one-dimensional array or row (entry lines)).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Rao into Lokuge to provide one-dimensional rows in a hierarchical arrangement on a graphical display, as taught by Rao, incorporated into the hierarchical arrangement of indented categories (entries), as taught by Lokuge, in order to permit the user to quickly and efficiently specify and locate information of particular interest.

**Regarding dependent claim 35**, Rao discloses:

in which the entry lines are rendered at lateral positions corresponding to information in one or more of the predefined fields of entry information (on col. 10, lines 35-37: teaches data array is a combination of data items mapped into an array).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Rao into Lokuge to provide a way to map data items into a

Art Unit: 2176

data array, as taught by Rao, incorporated into the system of Lokuge, in order to enhance the display of images directly representing an item of data in the data structure.

10. **Claims 4-6, 13, 27-29, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lokuge-Rao as applied to claims 1-3, 7-12, 14-26, 30-35, and 37-42 above, and further in view of Durham et al. (USPN 5,832,502 – filed on 7/1996).**

**Regarding dependent claims 4 and 27,** Lokuge and Rao discloses the invention substantially as claimed as described *supra*. However, Lokuge and Rao do not explicitly disclose, “in which each information entry has an originator and in which the one or more predefined fields of entry information relate to the originator of the information entry and the originator is indicated in the entry line for the information entry”.

Durham et al. (Durham on col. 6, lines 13-34, see figure 3D: teaches displayed a number of child blocks (fields) with messages and users name (originator) of the messages.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Durham into Lokuge and Rao to provide a display of a number of child blocks (fields) occupied with messages and user names of the messages, as taught by Durham, incorporated into the systems of Lokuge and Rao, in order to indicate the depth of the conversation, resulting in the desired visual display.

**Regarding dependent claims 5 and 28,** Lokuge discloses:

in which plural information entries may share a common originator (Durham on col. 6, lines 13-34, see figure 3D: teaches displayed a number of child blocks (fields) with messages and which may be common users name (originator) of the messages) and in which the color of an

Art Unit: 2176

entry line corresponds to the number of information entries provided by the originator of the entry line (Lokuge on col. 7, lines 35-48: teaches color corresponding to categories).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Durham into Lokuge and Rao to provide a display of a number of child blocks (fields) occupied with messages and user names of the messages, as taught by Durham, incorporated into the systems of Lokuge and Rao, in order to indicate the depth of the conversation, resulting in the desired visual display.

**Regarding dependent claims 6, 13, 29, and 36, Durham discloses:**

in which each information entry has an associated time and in which the one or more predefined fields of entry information relate to the associated time of the information entry and the associated time is indicated by positioning of the entry line for the information entry (Durham on col. 6, lines 13-34, see figure 3D: teaches items proportional to number of child blocks in the conversation index; displaying the time messages were created).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Durham into Lokuge and Rao to provide a display of a number of child blocks (fields) occupied with messages and user names of the messages, as taught by Durham, incorporated into the systems of Lokuge and Rao, in order to indicate the depth of the conversation, resulting in the desired visual display.

***Response to Arguments***

11. Applicant's arguments filed on 7/27/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding Applicant's remarks on pages 11-14:

Referring to independent claims 1 and 23 (as currently rejected), in response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In this case, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Rao into Lokuge to provide one-dimensional rows in a hierarchical arrangement on a graphical display (as shown in Figures 14 and 15), as taught by Rao, incorporated into the hierarchical arrangement of indented categories (entries) (as shown in Figures 15 and 16), as taught by Lokuge, in order to permit the user to quickly and efficiently specify and locate information of particular interest.

The Examiner has shown proper suggestion and motivation to combine Rao into Lokuge and therefore, has maintained all rejections for claims 1-42.

*Conclusion*

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Almari Yuan whose telephone number is 703-305-5945 (571-272-4104 after October 20, 2004). The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays - Fridays (8:30am - 5:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild, can be reached on 703-305-9792 (571-272-4090 after October 20, 2004). The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AY  
October 15, 2004

*William L. Bashore*

WILLIAM L. BASHORE  
PATENT EXAMINER  
TECH CENTER 2100